



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,345	07/22/2003	Gregory J. Petras	WC01520-2	9776
28548	7590	11/30/2006	EXAMINER	
STONEMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD 3113 NORTH 3RD STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85012			ALI, MOHAMMAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO/ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10/624,345 7/24/03 Petras et al.

W 01520-2

EXAMINER

M. ALI

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2166

20061129

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Please withdraw the finality mailed on 5/10/06.

Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2166

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/624,345	Applicant(s) PETRAS ET AL.	
	Examiner Mohammad Ali	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36 and 43-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36 and 43-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the arguments filed 8/9/06.

Claims 35-36 and 43-85 are pending in this Office Action.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contents more than one paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Abstract should be single paragraph.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1-A as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "a printer, a mouse", with elements 1-14, 1-16 of Fig. 1-A, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A *descriptive* textual label for *each numbered element* in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing. Optionally, applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.83. 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o) is recited below:
"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 35-36 and 43-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Peters et al. ('Peters' hereinafter), USP 5,842,195.

With respect to claim 35,

Peters teaches an Internet website client-server computer system, for use to determine by e-mail survey a level of subject approval for each one of a population of survey participants by capturing each such participant's opinions about the degree of relevance of each of a respective set of natural language terms to each of a respective set of subjects (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7), comprising:

a) a client interface system arranged so that a survey taker may indicate at least i) a defined question for the survey, ii) a such set of subjects to be evaluated, iii) a such set of natural-language terms to be rated as to relevancy to each subject, iv) a participant audience, and v) a time-frame for response (see col. 12 lines 38-50, Peters);

b) a server computer processor system connected with said client interface system (see Fig. 13, Peters); and c) a server computer software system, operational with said server computer processor system, arranged to provide survey processing comprising i) compiling a survey file and survey document in accordance with survey taker input, ii) communicating such survey document to such participant audience, and iii) receiving and tabulating responses (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 36,

Peters teaches displaying survey results at a publicized URL (see col. 1, lines 15-25, Peters).

With respect to claim 43,

Peters teaches, an Internet client-server system for assisting at least one group of users having at least one common goal to capture and search, in a single database, offered knowledge, relevant to such at least one common goal, of a plurality of such users for the benefit of at least one of such users (see col. 6, lines 10-23, Fig. 13), comprising: a) individually capturing for such database at least one experience of at least some of such plurality (see Fig. 13, Peters);

b) storing in such database such experience (see col. 21, lines 59-67, Peters); c) user-searching, using at least one natural-language word, to select at least one desired kind of stored experience (see col. 22, lines 10-20, Peters);

d) performing such user-searching (see col. 3, lines 60-67, Peters); and e) presenting search results (see col. 4, lines 2-6, Peters).

As to claim 44,

Peters teaches searchably capturing for such database at least one item of such knowledge selected from the group consisting essentially of a) user-advice b) opinions of experts c) people who can help d) miscellaneous such knowledge of users (see col. 3, lines 30-35 et seq, Fig. 13, Peters).

As to claim 45,

Peters teaches a substantially automatic website management system (see col. 12, lines 10-20, Peters).

As to claim 46,

Peters teaches automatically rewarding assisting users for website management assistance (see col. 12, lines 10-20, Peters).

As to claim 47,

Peters teaches a) providing a software management system to directly manage such database and such population of users essentially without outside management (see Fig. 13, Peters); and b) providing for variables in such software management system to be configurable without affecting such direct management operations (see col. 12, lines 11-25, Peters); c) wherein such software management system comprises i) measuring management efforts of each of at least one management sub-community (see col. 18, lines 20-40 et seq, Peters), ii) setting goals for each of such management community, and iii) managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such management sub-community (see Figs. 6-8, Peters).

As to claim 48,

Peters teaches searchably capturing for such database such knowledge of users concerning useful knowledge sources outside such group of users (see Fig. 13, Peters).

As to claim 49,

Peters teaches searchably capturing for such database such knowledge of users concerning useful knowledge sources outside such group of users (see Figs. 13 and 15, Peters).

As to claim 50,

Peters teaches a) providing at least one capability for at least one user to complete on-line at least one multiple choice poll (see col. 1, lines 46-50, Peters); and

b) providing at least one reward for such at least one user to completing such at least one multiple choice poll (see col. 1, lines 55-60, Peters).

As to claim 51,

Peters teaches wherein: a) such common goal is sales-oriented (see col. 5, lines 45-48, Peters); b) such group of users comprises sales personnel (see col. 5 lines 45-48 et seq, Peters); and c) those receiving such benefit comprise sales personnel (see col. 5 lines 45-48, Peters).

As to claim 52,

Peters teaches wherein such step of user-searching, using at least one natural-language word, to select at least one desired kind of stored knowledge, further comprises: a) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience associated with chosen such at least one natural language word; b) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the text of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word; c) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the category of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word; and d) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the title of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 53,

Peters teaches automatically managing a reward system to reward efforts of such at least one user (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 54,

Peters teaches a) automatically measuring and storing each experience contribution, including users' comments made by each such at least one user (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters) b) assigning points to be accumulated for each such experience contribution (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); c) automatically accumulating assigned points for each such experience contribution by each such at least one user (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); d) automatically reporting such points accumulated for each such experience contribution (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Fig. 13 Peters); e) defining at least one criteria for awarding prizes based on such accumulated points (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); and f) automatically awarding prizes to such at least one user with accumulated points meeting such at least one criteria (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Figs. 5-7, Peters).

As to claim 55,

Peters teaches a) managing such database and such group of users essentially without customer website management (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); b) permitting at least one customer to configure a plurality of variables in such computer software for such managing of such database (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7); c) automatically setting goals for each such user participating in at least one management community (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); and d) automatically managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of

such at least one user of such at least one management community (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 56,

Peters teaches a) rating the relative overall value of each such at least one item of such experience according to the opinion of each of such involved subset of such population of users (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); b) collecting comments about each at least one item of such experience according to the opinion of each of such involved subset of such population of users (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7); and c) associating, in such database, respective such ratings of relative overall value and respective such collected comments with respective such at least one item of such experience (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 57,

Peters teaches automatically accumulating system operation data (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 58,

Peters teaches wherein such system operation data comprises: a) data about compliance with such set of performance goals for each of at least one involved subset of such population of users (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); b) data about each type of such stored experience (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7); c) data about such reward system (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); and d) data about interviews of each of such involved subset of such population of users (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 59,

Peters teaches permitting such at least one user to view successively more detailed levels of such automatically accumulated system operation data (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7).

As to claim 60,

Peters teaches a) requesting installation of at least one independent database access module onto the personal computer of such at least one user (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Fig. 1, Peters); b) permitting selection, using such independent database access module, of at least one category of such knowledge for display by such at least one user (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters); c) automatically searching, using such at least one independent database access module, such database, without need of a browser, for at least one selected category of such knowledge from such database (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters); and d) displaying, using such at least one independent database access module, found knowledge from such at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such database to such at least one user (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters).

As to claim 61,

Peters teaches a) displaying continuously at least one selected type of such pre-determined information from at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such knowledge stored in such database to such at least one user (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters); and b) scrolling a display of at least one selected type of

such pre-determined information from at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such knowledge stored in such database to such at least one user (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters).

As to claim 62,

Peters teaches a) making specific requests for information from information stored in such database by such at least one user (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters).

As to claim 63,

Peters teaches a) receiving at least one request for information from such at least one user (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); b) storing such at least one request for information (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); c) notifying designated other such at least one user with particular expertise about such at least one request for information (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters); d) storing such at least one request for information and at least one response by such at least one user with particular expertise as such at least one experience (see col. 12 lines 38-50 and col. 19, lines 17-19, Peters); and e) notifying such at least one user, requesting information, of such at least one experience containing such at least one request and such at least one response (see col. 4, lines 24-40, Fig. 5-7, Peters).


Claims 64-85 have the same subject matter as of claims above and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

MA
November 20, 2006